REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Electronic Document Management System

Second Judicial District Court
April 2005

Part A: INTRODUCTION

1 PURPOSE, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1.1 PURPOSE

The Second Judicial District Court ("Court") is the largest district court in the state of New Mexico. It manages 36% of all district court cases filed in the State. There currently exists a storage crisis with regard to archived records and a diminishing efficiency of the judiciary as a result of the numbers of pleadings coming to the Court on a daily basis and the lack of personnel to handle either situation.

As the Court studied remedies to its crisis, it became acutely aware of the multiple issues related to electronic document management and archiving records in a digital format. Any system contemplated for purchase would have to be user friendly, interface with the Court's case management program and be able to address some of the paper management concerns of support divisions

In those support divisions, the digital data that make up e-mail messages, database systems, websites and other information systems have significance beyond the immediate *business* needs of the Court. As data are created, used, and communicated in the course of its business, useful evidence is created – a *record* – of the Court's past activities. For administrative, legal, financial, accountability and historical reasons, these records are valuable to the Court, the judiciary as a whole and to the public. Thus, all digital data created or received in the conduct of Court business are public records under the Sections 14-3-6 of the Public Records Act and must be managed with the same care as paper records, just as regular Court pleadings. The Court must also ensure that these business records are captured, survive as long as they are needed, and can be read and understood in the future.

1.1.1 The purpose of this Request for Proposal (RFP) is for the Court to solicit bids from vendors interested in proposing solutions, technologies, and fixed fee cost for selection of an electronic document management system that can respond to the Court's legal and business needs.

1.1.2 Given the Court's requirements, it is left to the vendor to describe clearly their solution in response to the RFP.

1.2 SCOPE

1.2.1 The scope of the RFP encompasses the integration and customization of a system or systems that will: 1) manage, maintain, and store records for the Court as identified in case management, record retention and disposition schedules; 2)

program associated work flows, template forms, form packets for use by court personnel and the public; 3) program related business rules required to ensure proper document processing, preservation and continued accessibility of records; 4) program archival rules and processes required for life cycle management of permanent Court records and; 5) program code for a batch process to update metadata from the Court case management system.

The Court will provide guidelines for the management, access, and security of its records which are imaged and stored electronically. These guidelines will provide guidance to vendors as they program the management of electronic records throughout their lifecycle, from initial system design to the final disposal or permanent preservation. These rules will cover records created using all types of computerized environments, including personal computers, distributed networks, mainframes, spatial data systems and multimedia systems.

1.3   OBJECTIVES

1.3.1   The objectives of this RFP are to review and select from available avenues of action and technologies that can provide some or all components of an integrated solution that will deliver the functionality necessary to achieve the following key outcomes:

- Application of records management principles to electronic records in a virtual storage setting
- Application of archival management principles of preservation and description to electronic records in a virtual storage setting
- Secure reliable storage of electronic records
- Integrated search and retrieval of records
- Fault tolerant architecture
- Comply with the Supreme Court and AOC/JID guidelines
- Utilize proven technology
- Provide mechanisms for controlling and preserving characteristics considered essential to the record's life cycle
- Provide a preservation program with the ability to preserve any digital record brought into the Court's custody regardless of the application or system from which it comes or data format in which it is stored and based on non-proprietary technologies.
- Provide a solution that possesses user intuitive interface and include collaborative tools and interface of audio and video media.
- Demonstrable ease of creating workflow for clerk and support divisions, which will enhance the ability of those offices to be more efficient in their work.
- Ease of access to critical documents by key users, internal and external to the Court, with appropriate layering of security.
- Propose solution to migration of images from microfilm to digital format.
- Immediate vendor assistance/response if the system has problems so loss of productivity by users is minimized.

- Involve Court IT staff in application customization and implementation
- Provide formalized technical training for IT staff and straightforward "ease of use" training for end users.

1.3.2   To achieve this objective the Court is open to considering a single integrated system solution or discrete systems, that when combined, form a fully integrated solution.

2   ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

2.1   GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

2.1.1   This RFP is open to all interested vendors.

2.1.2   The Court is not responsible for any costs incurred by vendors responding to this RFP.

2.1.3   The intent of the Court is to select a vendor with the best possible solution for the electronic management of Court documents and records.

2.1.4   This document contains information and requirements that were accurate at the time of issue. Variations in these details may arise from continued analysis of the various requirements that form the basis of this RFP.

2.1.5   The Court reserves the right to approach vendors for additional information.

2.1.6   Vendors' responses must be provided in paper hardcopy as outlined in section 2.2.2.

2.1.7   The Court shall not be obligated to provide any explanation on any outcome(s) resulting from this RFP.

2.2   RESPONSES AND QUESTIONS

2.2.1   **RESPONSES SHOULD BE DELIVERED, IN A SEALED ENVELOPE, WITH EIGHT PAPER COPIES AND ONE PDF COPY ON CD INCLUDED, AND MUST BE RECEIVED BY 5:00 P.M., FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 2005. SEALED RESPONSES SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO:**

Juanita M. Duran, Court Administrator
Second Judicial District Court
400 Lomas NW, Room 325
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Envelopes *must be* clearly marked on the outside "*SEALED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM*". **Do NOT include any correspondence requiring answers with the response. Submit any questions in separate correspondence.**

NOTE: The Procurement Code, Sections 13-1-28 through 13-1-199 NMSA 1978, imposes civil and misdemeanor criminal penalties for its violation. In addition, the New Mexico criminal statutes impose felony penalties for bribes, gratuities and kickbacks.

2.2.2   Late responses to this RFP will not be accepted. It is the responsibility of the vendor to ensure its response arrives prior to the established deadline.

2.2.3   Questions relating to this RFP shall be directed to **Victoria Garcia at (505) 841-7599, albdvbg@nmcourts.com**.

2.2.4   The Court will attempt, within the next week, to acknowledge via e-mail that it received vendor's response.

2.2.5   Vendors must respond to the information required in Part B of this RFP.

Responses are to follow the structure and content of Part B. Examples of the expected response format are provided in Appendix B.

1.   Responses to each requirement shall include a brief description of how the solution meets the requirement, or any workaround, or alternative options available. Direct reference to pre-prepared or promotional material may be used. The pre-prepared material must be attached as an appendix to the response and clearly marked for ease of reference. *Promotional material should be minimal.*

2.   Responses to each requirement in Section 5 (Functional Requirements) must specify whether the requirement is:
     Fully met (F)   Not met (N)
     Partially met (P)   Not responding (NR)

3.   Where the requirement is shown in Section 5, then each requirement is to be marked with an "F", "P", "N" or "NR" as applicable.

2.3   CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION

2.3.1   The Court is a public entity within the New Mexico state government and as such abides by the Public Records Act and the Inspection of Public Records Act. Vendor responses not specifically marked as confidential, or are not specifically protected under law or statute, will be treated as a public record available for inspection by the public.

2.3.2   If appropriate, it is the responsibility of the responding vendor to mark on the upper right hand corner of the page or pages "Confidential" or "Proprietary".

2.4   TIMELINE

2.4.1   The Court's timeline for this RFP is: **RFP issued Sunday, April 3, 2005. Responses received by Friday, April 22, 2005. Review and award notification by May 6, 2005. *(This date may be postponed for a week depending upon the number of vendor bids.)***

3   BUSINESS OVERVIEW

3.1   THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
The Judicial Branch is the third branch of the government. Its mission stems from the State and United States Constitutions and includes the right to determine controversies between individual litigants. Its power is a judicial power, to hear causes of action and determine outcomes. In New Mexico, the Second Judicial District Court is the largest court of general jurisdiction and it is a Court of record. The 24 judges and 10 hearing officers hear the largest numbers of cases in controversy with voluminous pleadings comprising the Court record. The retention schedule for closed cases is "forever". Due to its high caseload, it also has the largest number of employees to support the work of the Court. Documents and records produced from those support divisions have diverse retention schedules; their import is enterprise-wide as documents produced by the Court may be used in litigation and/or other types of administrative hearings. As the Court continues to use technology to make its work more efficient, its employees are using e-mail and other forms of electronic communication. The documents must be captured and retained as prescribed by the legislature.

3.2   USERS
Judges and staff of the district court and affiliated agencies, such as the district attorney's office and public defenders' office.

3.2.1   End-users manage their own documents and email at the desktop.

3.2.2   The Court manages physical records within its facilities and at the storage facility of State Records and Archives. Currently, it also images some closed documents through a vendor.

3.2.3   The information systems staff manages the agency's web site, network, and servers; they work in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the Courts/Judicial Information Division.

3.3   EXISTING INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The primary system components used by the Court for the management of internal electronic systems are:

3.3.1 Windows 95 - SCAN SERVER – Archives & Records Storage.

3.3.2 Windows 98 – SLOANS – Student Loans.

3.3.3 Windows 2000 - KEYFILE – Document Imaging, HR Storage.

3.3.4 IBM AIX Servers –ALBDDEV – Application Development, NEWALBD – Case Management (Informix Database).

3.3.5 LINUX Servers – ABQ, Future Case Management, DOS – Application Development.

3.3.6 Novell Servers - 5

Appendix D contains further detail on the Court's information technology environment.

B: INFORMATION REQUIRED

Note: Vendors must respond in the manner described in paragraph 2.2.5.

4   GENERAL INFORMATION

4.1   SOLUTION OVERVIEW

4.1.1 Provide an overview of the proposed solution, taking into account the requirements outlined in this RFP. This must include:
   a. Product(s) functionality and features
   b. Components of the solution, including any third party products or tools that form part of the solution, with any associated licensing costs
   c. Services offered (installation, integration, training, support, etc.)
   d. COTS (Commercial-Off-The Shelf), custom, or hybrid solution
   e. Description of a successful implementation(s)
   f. Description of any successful Court implementation

Vendor Response:

4.1.2 The vendor must describe any strategic alliances made with other vendors whose product(s), when combined with the responding vendor's product(s) solution, will meet the functionality required in this RFP.

Vendor Response:
4.2   VENDOR INFORMATION

4.2.1   Contact information including name, address, telephone number, fax number, and email address of the primary contact for the RFP.

Vendor Response:

4.2.2   Company Profile
Provide the following information about parent, associate companies and third parties (if any), which may be involved in providing an integrated solution.

   a. Name, address and telephone number
   b. Website address
   c. Number of years in business
   d. Number of years in business providing records management solutions; note specifically any experience working with Courts.
   e. Size and nature of operation in the United States of America (USA) and or outside of the USA (including number of staff and geographic location)

Vendor Response:

4.2.3 Outline prior experience in implementing the potential solution including:
   a. Number of and year of implementation
   b. Location of implementations
   c. Business of the purchasing organizations (courts, government, bank, medical, etc)
   d. Modules (if applicable) installed or utilized in the implemented solution

Vendor Response:

4.2.4   Provide at least three reference sites for the solution presented which the Court may contact. The vendor must also provide details and a brief description of the solution, both software and hardware, implemented at these sites.

Vendor Response:

4.2.5   Provide an outline of the customer service model employed to manage and meet the customer's future system requirements.

Vendor Response:

4.2.6   Provide an outline of the product's future direction and product development strategy for the next three to five years.

Vendor Response:

4.3   COSTS

4.3.1   Provide cost information associated with the solution including:
   a. Base product costs and the basis for the pricing (i.e. number of users, modules, servers, etc.) assuming 222 named users, 2 system administrators, 2 developers, and 2 audio/video media management licenses, and whether enterprise vs. application-specific licensing opportunities exist.
   b. Any additional fees for backup, development or remote server installations
   c. Typical hardware and software infrastructure costs
   d. Annual maintenance and support costs
   e. Integration Cost by phase (see Appendix C)
   f. Case management system interface (batch metadata upload)
   g. Training costs for IT and User staff
   h. Optional pricing with extended expiration date of November 30, 2005 for the Metropolitan Court, Albuquerque, NM consisting of 185 additional named users.

Vendor Response:

5   FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

The following outlines the base functional requirements of the electronic document management system solution sought by the Second Judicial District Court.

5.1   SEARCH AND RETRIEVAL

5.1.1   The solution will provide the ability to search across individual and multiple repositories and document formats: image, document, audio, and video, etc.

Vendor Response:

5.1.2   Describe how a user can search on metadata elements or retention description.

Vendor Response:

5.1.3   The solution must provide an intuitive search engine with features including:
   a. Simple user query construction
   b. Boolean, wildcard, exact phrase
   c. Word variance
   d. Natural language, thesaurus, synonym
   e. Date range
   f. Search refinement
   g. Unique identifiers
   h. Prioritization of results

       i.   Inclusive and exclusive results

Vendor Response:

5.1.4   The solution must provide search history and sortable search results

Vendor Response:

5.1.5   The solution must provide for output of search results via print and other formats such as MS Access, MS Excel, etc.

Vendor Response:

5.1.6   The solution must identify requirements for transmitting reliable and authentic information between and across business processes.

Vendor Response:

5.1.7   The solution must allow a search of OCR'd documents by text string

Vendor Response:

5.1.8   Describe how methods implemented allow quick navigation through documents.

Vendor Response:

5.1.9   Describe how, upon completion of search, the solution will immediately display all selected images and support.

Vendor Response:

5.1.10 Describe how solution provides customizable collaboration workspace for select users organized by case or calendar, permits access by participating agencies/attorneys, notifies the above users when changes/additions to the workspaces occur, and how it provides dynamic retrieval of related case information, case statistics and other necessary reports.

Vendor Response:

5.2   METADATA

5.2.1   The solution will provide for multiple profiles and customizable profile screens

Vendor Response:

5.2.2 The solution will provide intuitive profiling (i.e. automatically populate several metadata elements of the profile)

Vendor Response:

5.2.3 The solution will provide metadata validation.

Vendor Response:

5.2.4 The system will support multiple profile defaults.

Vendor Response:

5.2.5 The system will provide a way to delete metadata at the end of the retention period

Vendor Response:

5.2.6 The system will provide a way to hide metadata when documents are sequestered or sealed.

Vendor Response:

See 5.9.4

5.3   RECORDS MANAGEMENT

5.3.1 Describe how the solution provides for the application of records management principles for electronic records.

Vendor Response:

5.3.2 Describe how the solution provides file tracking and control including audit logs.

Vendor Response:

5.3.3 Describe how the solution supports a file classification scheme.

Vendor Response:

5.3.4 Describe how the solution provides for retention and disposition scheduling.

Vendor Response:

5.3.5   Describe how the solution provides for integrity of file status and validation of metadata profiles.

Vendor Response:

5.3.6   Describe how the solution accommodates the disposition process for both transitory and permanent records.

Vendor Response:

5.3.7   Describe how the solution addresses disaster preparedness, in the event of a disaster.

Vendor Response:

5.4   ARCHIVES MANAGEMENT

5.4.1   Describe how the system provides for the application of the archival management principles of preservation and access.

Vendor Response:

5.4.2   Describe how the solution supports automatic migration of documents and images to and from less expensive types of online storage (i.e., microfilm) based on frequency of access and case status.

Vendor Response:

5.4.3   Describe how the solution provides a mechanism ensuring the authenticity of the electronic file.

Vendor Response:

5.4.4   Detail the processes available for exporting images and metadata to CD, DVD, microfilm or other media.

Vendor Response:

5.5   SECURITY AND ACCESS

5.5.1   The solution will provide for assignment of security and access levels at both the file and individual document level.

Vendor Response:

5.5.2   The solution shall allow for multiple security levels and roles for administration, system management, workgroup management, etc.

Vendor Response:

5.5.3   Describe how the solution provides for integration into Network Operating Systems architectures including:
   a. Novell
   b. Microsoft

Vendor Response:

5.5.4   Describe how the system provides comprehensive security, down to the page level, for every action (including print, fax, and e-mail).

Vendor Response:

5.5.5   Describe how the system uses secure sockets layer (SSL) protocol to encrypt data transfer.

Vendor Response:

5.5.6   Describe how the system provides an audit trail, including date, time, user and transaction.

Vendor Response:

5.5.7   Describe how the system supports security audit reporting on document access including document type, user ID, date and time range, access by workstation / location.

Vendor Response:

5.5.8   Describe how the system allows for the option of single sign-on when multiple application modules are executed, leveraging the use of user's network sign-on.

Vendor Response:

5.5.9   Use of Firewalls allowing access from outside court.

Vendor Response:

5.5.10 Database tier should optionally use application log-on ID to manage access of database tables using third-party products.

Vendor Response:

5.6   WORKFLOW AND HELP

5.6.1   The solution should provide a supervisory workflow review and approval capability.

Vendor Response:

5.6.2   The solution must provide online contextual help to assist users.

Vendor Response:

5.6.3   The solution must allow the Court to redefine workflow, as needed and approved, without going through the vendor

Vendor Response:

5.6.3   The solution must provide a visual, graphical (GUI) workflow tool to design workflow processes by "dragging and dropping" icons representing workflow steps.

Vendor Response:

5.6.4   Support "point-and-click" configuration enabling customization of workflow processes and user interface without additional programming.

Vendor Response:

5.6.5   Provide flexibility for authorized users to route documents on an ad hoc, exception basis (e.g. for special review) outside of normal automated routing.

Vendor Response:

5.6.6   Provide ability to monitor which task the user is performing and automatically open documents (e.g. for reference) appropriate for that task.

Vendor Response:

5.6.7   Describe integration of electronic signature or E-Pad devices into your solution.

Vendor Response:

5.6.8   Provide ability to initiate workflow processes upon receipt of electronic forms, Internet forms, and e-mail messages.

Vendor Response:

5.6.9   Provide ability for transaction tracking notification.

Vendor Response:

5.7   REPORTING

5.7.1   The solution should be SQL compliant.

Vendor Response:

5.7.2   The solution must include and generate user definable reports

Vendor Response:

5.8   EDITING

5.8.1   Provide document editing software for annotation of images, audio and video which do not contain text, as well as editing files created by means of OCR.

Vendor Response:

5.8.2   Support popular "off-the-shelf" word processing software, such as MS-Word or WordPerfect, for annotation of images.

Vendor Response:

5.8.3   Provide ability to apply "sticky notes"or text notes to all document, audio and video files, and retain the relationship of notes to the page.

Vendor Response:

5.8.4   Support document versioning.

Vendor Response:

5.8.5   Provide ability to apply <u>security</u> to "sticky notes"or text notes on all document types and retain the relationship of notes to the originator or authorized viewers.

Vendor Response:

5.8.5   Provide for automated redaction of SSN and other privileged information.

Vendor Response:

5.9   IMPORT OF EXTERNAL FILES

5.9.1   Provide ability to import image and text files generated externally (i.e. by vendors scanning backlog documents or microfiche).

Vendor Response:

5.9.2   Provide ability to import image, video, audio, and text files generated by word processing, spreadsheet, court reporting, graphics and other applications.

Vendor Response:

5.9.3   Support import of .doc and .xls files and list other file types that can be imported.

Vendor Response:

5.9.4   Provide ability to import and maintain metadata from external sources.

Vendor Response:

5.10   TEXT, IMAGE, AUDIO AND VIDEO MANIPULATION

5.10.1 Provide ability to jump to pages or information contained in a document, audio, or video file.

Vendor Response:

5.10.2 Provide ability to highlight words from search specification.

Vendor Response:

5.10.3 Provide ability to attach annotations to stored files without altering the original.

Vendor Response:

5.10.4 Provide use of "watermark" technology providing certification/legality of documents.

Vendor Response:

5.11   APPLICATION PROGRAMMING INTERFACE (API)

5.11.1 Identify the system's interface with the following programming products:
       a.   Java programming language
       b.   .NET programming language
       c.   Other programming language (be specific)

Vendor Response:

5.11.2 Describe toolkits or programmer workbenches available to customize an application.

Vendor Response:

5.11.3 Identify any system interfaces with:
      a. Tiburon FACTS Case Management System
      b. Informix Relational Database
      d. MS Access
      e. Crystal Reports

Vendor Response:

5.12   FORMS GENERATION/PROCESSING

5.12.1 Allows editing of document templates and application of electronic signature using a tablet or pad device, followed by image import and associated workflow routing of the document. Describe how finished documents are "locked down" for archival purposes.

Vendor Response:

5.12.2 Facilitates form preparation by pre-populating form data fields or using drop down lists from the document management system metadata tables or external data sources.

Vendor Response:

5.12.3 Provides web-based forms engineered to support Internet E-Filing.

Vendor Response:

5.13   PRODUCT DOCUMENTATION/TRAINING

5.13.1 Describe the various installation, administration, user and training manuals available.

Vendor Response:

5.13.2 Describe available training courses (location, length, etc.), schedules, and onsite vs. offsite training options. How are these costs incorporated in the proposal?

Vendor Response:

5.14   SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

5.14.1 Describe the various utilities available to compress and reorganize indices, images, and metadata tables.

Vendor Response:

5.14.2 Describe other performance management and/or tuning utilities.

Vendor Response:

5.15   INTEGRATION SERVICES

5.15.1 Is integration staff, assigned to assist the customer onsite, product "certified" and / or document management system architecture "certified"?

Vendor Response:

5.15.2 Does vendor integration staff have experience in Court implementations? If so, please describe

Vendor Response:

5.15.3 Does integration staff install, test and tune associated EDMS software components and underlying database software?

Vendor Response:

5.15.4 Does integration staff install and test specialized print and scan drivers on related hardware?

Vendor Response:

5.15.5 How are integration services built into the proposal?

Vendor Response:

5.15.6 Will court IT staff be trained and integrated at each step to facilitate platform knowledge transfer?

Vendor Response:

5.15.7 Will the underlying "customized" source code be given to the Court? Can that source code be modified by the customer?

Vendor Response:

6 TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

The following outlines the base technological requirements of the electronic records storage system sought by the Second Judicial District Court.

6.1 SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

6.1.1 Provide an overview of the system architecture.

Vendor Response:

6.1.2 Provide an overview, with major milestones, of the product's development, up to and including its current release.

Vendor Response:

6.1.3 Provide information on the proposed solution's scalability.

Vendor Response:

6.1.4 Provide information on the proposed solution's interoperability.

Vendor Response:

6.1.5 Provide information on the proposed solution's ability to configure and communicate with remote site installations, and provide recommendation for bandwidth between main and remote sites.

Vendor Response:

6.1.6 Provide information on the proposed solution's cluster awareness under Windows 2003.

Vendor Response:

6.2 TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

6.2.1 On what hardware platforms is the solution "certified"?

Vendor Response:

6.2.2   What is the recommended hardware configuration?

Vendor Response:

6.2.3   What database systems does the solution support? Please include version
         numbers and related information (e.g. service packs, etc.)

Vendor Response:

6.2.4   What operating systems does the solution run under?

Vendor Response:

6.2.5   What is the recommended operating system?

Vendor Response:

6.2.6   What network protocols does the system support?

Vendor Response:

6.2.7   Is the application written in Java or .NET?

Vendor Response:

6.2.8   What web servers are certified for use with your web-based components?

Vendor Response:

6.2.9   If images are converted to PDF format for web viewing, does the associated
         Adobe Writer/Publisher software come bundled with your solution or must it be
         purchased separately?

Vendor Response:

6.2.10 Is the product DoD 5015.2 certified?

Vendor Response:

7   IMPLEMENTATION AND SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS

7.1   IMPLEMENTATION

7.1.1   Outline the integration of the system, including:
         a. Project management
         b. Installation and setup

     c. Customization and software enhancements
     d. Implementation
     e. Training IT/User
     f. Testing
     g. Post implementation support

Vendor Response:

7.1.2   Describe the approach (es) you have taken to ensure the solution meets a customer's needs?

Vendor Response:

7.1.3   Provide examples of strategies or approaches used in implementations similar to the Court's requirements.

Vendor Response:

7.2   MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT

7.2.1   How frequently are versions released? What information can you provide about recent or proposed releases?

Vendor Response:

7.2.2   Briefly outline how you will support all components of the potential solution for a state government customer including all solution documentation and any options.

Vendor Response:

7.3   RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (R&D)

7.3.1   Is annual maintenance applied toward product R&D? If yes, what percentage?

Vendor Response:

7.3.2   What percentage, respectively, of 2003 and 2004 income (EBIT), went toward product R&D? What percentage is budgeted for 2005?

Vendor Response:

APPENDICES

Appendix A.   Document Formats within the Court

MS Office Suite	.doc, .mdb, .xls, .ppt
FoxPro	.dbf
PDF	.pdf
Email Formats: RTF, TXT	.rtf, .txt
Image files JPEG, GIF, etc.	.Jpeg, .jpg, .gif, .wmf, .png
HTML	.html, .htm, .asp
SGML	.sgml
Court Reporting	PROCAT .stn, FTR wave sound
Audio/video	.mp3, .wav, .mid, .mpg, .wmv, .mpeg
Word Perfect	.wpd

Appendix B.   Response Format

Example 1

4.1.1   Provide an overview of the potential solution, taking into account the
requirements outlined in this RFP. This is to include:
   a. Product(s) functionality and features
   b. Components of the solution including any third party products or tools that
      form part of the solution
   c. Services offered (implementation, support, etc.)
   d. COTS (Commercial-Off-The Shelf), custom, or hybrid solution
   e. Description of a successful implementation(s)

Vendor Response:

General description of the system and how it meets the requirements listed above.
Any references to detailed supporting material can be attached as addenda to this
response.

Example 2

6.2.7   In what language(s) is the application software developed?

Vendor Response:

General description of the solution

Appendix C.   Court Division Statistics and Deployment Plan

Rollout	Forms	Form Packets	% Open Cases	% Paper	% New Cases
Phase 1					
Civil	20	12	30%	66%	39%
Phase 2					
Family	46	45	19%	10%	26%
Criminal	25	9	33%	11%	20%
Children's	28	10	18%	13%	15%
Total	119	76			

37,000 open case files (7.2 million pages) and 29,000 new cases per year (6.3 million pages). Base scanning bid on 1.8 million pages per year for new cases, as future E-filing will reduce scanning requirements. Scanning of open files are one-time events occurring by phase. 522,000 closed case files (155 million pages) covering 1984-2004 will be scanned as needed when the files are requested by interested parties.   Documents, although similar in appearance, are typically unstructured.

Requirement for 16 production scanners, one with microfilm read/scan capability. Phase 1 rollout of 8 scanners.

Appendix D.   Technology Environment within the Court

Desktop
The Court's desktop computers have Windows NT 4.0, Windows 2000 or Windows XP Professional as the operating system. Applications are Windows Professional Suite; Netscape; Norton Anti-Virus; MS Explorer, WordPerfect. All desktop computers have Web access.

Server and applications
Applications other than basic MS business software:

Primary Systems: Informix, JAM, MS Access, Crystal Reports, and KEYFILE.

Secondary Systems: HRMS, BMS, BRS, CASA, YFC, CC.

Servers

- 2 IBM AIX
- 2 LINUX
- 1 Windows 95
- 1 Windows 98

- 10 Windows 2000
- 2 Windows NT
- 4 Novell

Applications

- FACTS – Case Management System (COT-Tiburon)
- AIMS - Financial Accounting Software (FoxPro)
- KEYFILE – Document Imaging HR Storage

The Informix Databases using JAM or Delphi are Court Alternatives, JURY, Special Services, Domestic Violence, Barcode Scan (record tracking) and Bench Warrant Cancel.

The MS Access Databases are Court Clinic (CC), Youth and Family Counseling (YFC), Capital Planning System (CPS), Human Resource Management System (HRMS), Budget Review System (BRS) and Intellitrack (Fixed Assets/Storehouse).

Crystal Reports used for reporting on Calendars and many other custom reports.

The web site is setup using MS IIS 5 with third party software for the search engine and app lock software. E-mail server runs Netscape. The Benefit Management System (BMS) is web based.

Network
The Court's network uses Fast Ethernet running TCP/IP supporting 100mps to the desktops through the use of Cisco switches.

Website
Intranet based on IIS5. The Court's firewalls are controlled by JID (Judicial Information Division) IIS5.

Backup
The servers are backed up using Veritas software.